Applicant	Marina Mile Properties, LLC. / Secure Storage at 84		
Request	Rezone from General Business District (B-2) & Residential Low Rise		
	Multifamily/Medium-High Density District (RML-25) to Planned Unit		
	Development District (PUD) including Site Plan Approval.		
General Location	East of Interstate Highway 95, North of the Access Road for State Road 84, and		
	West of the Osceola Canal.		
Legal Description	That part of Tracts 2, 3 and 4, of F.A. Barrett's subdivision,		
	Section 21, Township 50 South, Range 42 East, according to the plat thereof, recorded in P.B. 1, P. 46, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida,		
	lying north of State Road 84 and lying east of the east right-of-way line of State		
	Road 9, also known as Interstate Highway 95, lying west of the Osceola Canal.		
	Subject to effects of final judgment in eminent domain proceedings by S.R.D. of		
	Florida re limited access rights only, dated April 23, 1970 (		
	in minutes of the Circuit Court 191, Page 983 (#67-7542) said lands lying in the		
	City of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, FL.		
Property Size	187,769 SF / 4.31 Acres		
Zoning	Existing: General Business District (B-2) & Residential Low Rise		
	Multifamily/Medium-High Density District (RML-25)		
	Proposed: Planned Unit Development (PUD)		
Existing Use	Vacant		
Proposed Use of	252 012 SE vahiala staraga warahaysa		
Property	252,912 SF vehicle storage warehouse		
Future Land Use	Existing: Medium-High Residential and Commercial Proposed: Commercial		
Designation Designation	*		
Comprehensive Plan	Consistent with the permitted uses in the Future Land Use Element – Commercial Use (See Pg. 4 of staff report)		
Consistency Building Lot Coverage	45 %		
Landscaping Lot	TJ 70		
Coverage	29%		
VUA Landscaping	20%		
Parking	53 parking spaces required / 56 parking spaces provided		
Other Required	55 parking spaces required / 50 parking spaces provided		
Approvals	City Commission / By Ordinance		
Notice Requirements	Mail Notice to Property Owners within 300'		
Kodenement	Sign Notice Along Right-of-Ways		
	Newspaper Notice		
	(Notice Requirements Pursuant to Sec. 47-27.5)		
Applicable ULDR	Sec. 47-37 Planned Unit Development District		
Sections	Sec. 47-24.4 Rezoning		
	Sec. 47-25.2 Adequacy Requirements Sec. 47-25.3 Neighborhood Compatibility		
	Name and Title	Initials	
Project Planner	Ella Parker, Planner II	Zintituli	
•	Gregory Brewton, Acting Planning and Zoning Deputy		
Authorized By	Director		
	•		
Approved By	Marc LaFerrier, AICP, Planning and Zoning Director		
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		

Memorandum 7-ZPUD-05 February 15, 2006 Page 2

## **Request:**

The applicant is requesting a rezoning from General Business District (B-2) & Residential Low Rise Multifamily/Medium-High Density District (RML-25) to Planned Unit Development District (PUD) with site plan approval to construct a 252,912 SF vehicle storage warehouse building. The associated plat request is also scheduled on this agenda, case 31-P-05.

# **Property/Project Description:**

The site is generally located east of Interstate Highway 95, north of the frontage road abutting State Road 84, west of the Osceola Canal, and is bounded on the east by a commerce center, and on the north by a multi-family residential complex.

The property is currently split into two separate zoning districts. The majority of the site is zoned RMM-25 with underlying medium-high residential land use, and the remaining southern portion of the site is zoned B-2 with underlying commercial land use. Currently, the site is vacant. The applicant proposes to construct a warehouse building for the storage of vehicles in private bays. The proposed building is 374' long and 47'- 3" high to the top of the roof (59'- 3" high to top of highest parapet). As indicated on the site plan, 179 storage units are proposed.

The project was reviewed by the Development Review Committee (DRC) on November 8, 2005. On June 6, 2005, prior to the project submittal to the DRC, staff received a letter from Dennis Byk, Vice President of the River Oaks Civic Association regarding the proposal, attached as **Exhibit 5**.

## Adequacy and Neighborhood Compatibility:

The applicant has submitted narratives regarding the project's compliance with Sec. 47-25.2, Adequacy Requirements and Sec. 47-25.3, Neighborhood Compatibility Requirements, attached as **Exhibit 1**.

## **Rezoning to Planned Unit Development District:**

The proposed warehouse use is not a permitted use in neither the RMM-25 nor the B-2 existing zoning districts. The applicant has submitted a response narrative to the rezoning criteria of Sec. 47-24.4, attached as **Exhibit 2**, and a narrative outlining the design concepts of the development and how the proposal complies with Sec. 47-37, PUD Requirements, attached as **Exhibit 3**.

The applicant has indicated in their narratives that "the proposed use is unique and does not neatly fit into any of the existing designations in the City of Fort Lauderdale's ULDR" and that "the limited access to the subject property makes the site inappropriate for retail commercial development, and the proximity of the I-95 and State Road 84 corridors, and the noise created by these busy highways, makes it less than optimum site for residential development."

The applicant maintains that "This will be a very low impact, passive use which will help to preserve the Osceola Creek and help to serve as a buffer between I-95 and the surrounding uses. There are many uses within the current zoning on the property which would be much more intrusive to the neighborhood and the Creek..." The applicant also indicates that "...because of the environmentally sensitive nature of the adjacent Osceola Creek, the developer will be taking great care to maximize landscaping...and is...going to create a landscaped preserve area at the North end of the property..."

The following table depicts the building height, length, and setback requirements as are typically required in the zoning districts currently existing on site, as opposed to the dimensions as proposed through the PUD:

#### **Proposed Building Setbacks, Height and Length**

REQUIREMENT:	PUD PROPOSED:	TYPICALLY REQUIRED IN RMM-25 DISTRICT:
Building Height	47'- 3" Top of Roof (59'- 3" Top of Highest Parapet)	55' Maximum
Building Length	374'	200' Maximum
Front (S) Setback	270' (approximately at closest distance to property line)	25'
Side (E) Setback	18' (approximately at closest distance to property line)	23'-7.5" (1/2 height of building)*
Side (W) Setback	20' (approximately at closest distance to property line)	23'-7.5" (1/2 height of building)*
Rear (N) Setback	157' (approximately at closest distance to property line)	23'-7.5" (1/2 height of building)*
REQUIREMENT:	PUD PROPOSED:	TYPICALLY REQUIRED IN B-2 DISTRICT:
Building Height	47'- 3" Top of Roof (59'- 3" Top of Highest Parapet)	150' Maximum
Building Length	374'	None
Front (S) Setback	270'	5'
	(approximately at closest distance to property line)	
Side (E) Setback	18.40' (approximately at closest distance to property line)	None
Side (E) Setback Side (W) Setback	18.40'	None None 20'

<sup>\*</sup>As per ULDR Sec. 47-5.36, RMM-25 District, in no case shall the dimensional requirements be less than an amount equal to one-half the height of the building, when this is greater than the above specified yard minimums.

#### Parking and Traffic:

The applicant has provided a trip generation analysis, prepared by Pinder Troutman Consulting, Inc. attached as **Exhibit 4**. The number of trips generated indicates that a full traffic impact analysis is not required for the project. The DRC Engineering Representative concurs with these findings.

Vehicular access to the project will be from State Road 84 via the abutting frontage road. The bays are accessed by ramps to each floor. As per Sec. 47-20 Table 1, warehouses utilized for self storage require 1 parking space per 5,000 square feet of gross floor area, and 1 parking space per 250 square feet of office. The applicant is required to provide 53 parking spaces, and is proposing to provide 56 parking spaces.

Memorandum 7-ZPUD-05 February 15, 2006 Page 4

## **Comprehensive Plan Consistency:**

At the July 20, 2005 Planning and Zoning Board Meeting, the Board recommended to the City Commission PZ Case 2-T-05, a small scale land use amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan, proposing to change the land use designation of the northern portion of the subject site (3.38 acres) from Medium-High Residential to Commercial. On September 7, 2005 the City Commission adopted resolution 05-151, to transmit the proposed amendment to Broward County and to request that the County amend their Comprehensive Plan Map. The application is currently being processed through the County, and will subsequently require City Commission adoption. Finally, the amendment will have to be transmitted to the Broward County Planning Council for recertification of the Future Land Use Element. The proposal is consistent with the permitted uses in the Future Land Use Element –Commercial Use, contingent upon the finalization of the above-referenced land use amendment.

## **Conditions of Approval:**

If the Planning and Zoning Board recommends approval of the proposed project, the following staff conditions are recommended:

- 1) Approval of PZ Case 2-T-05, a small scale land use amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan, proposing to change the land use designation of the northern portion of the subject site (3.38 acres) from Medium-High Residential to Commercial has to be finalized prior to City Commission submittal.
- 2) As per DRC Landscape Representative, wetland species to be protected from construction activity. Applicant shall obtain all pertinent Department of Planning and Environmental Protection (DPEP) approvals prior to final DRC.
- 3) Prior to application for a building permit, a Construction Debris Mitigation Plan shall be submitted to include but not be limited to the requirements of the Construction Debris Mitigation Policy, and as approved by the City's Building Official.
- 4) Site plan approval shall be valid as provided in ULDR Sect. 47-24.1.
- 5) Final DRC approval.

# **Planning and Zoning Board Review:**

- 1. If the Planning and Zoning Board determines that the application meets the criteria for rezoning to Planned Unit Development, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the City Commission for consideration.
- 2. If the Planning and Zoning Board determines that the criteria for rezoning to Planned Unit Development have not been met, the Board shall deny the application and procedures for appeal to the City Commission as provided in Sec. 47-26B, Appeals, shall apply.